



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/640,168	08/15/2000	Hugh J. McLarty	09623-027700US	5174

20350 7590 06/15/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/640,168

Applicant(s)

MCLARTY ET AL.

Examiner

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The following office action is in response to the Amendment, filed February 7, 2005. Claims 15, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claim 21 is newly added. Claims 1-3, 5-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With respect to independent claim 15, applicant has amended the claim to disclose “a first shared peripheral bus interface coupling said internal bus to said shared peripheral bus.” The specification does not disclose an internal bus. Further, the specification does not disclose where a first shared peripheral bus interface couples an internal bus to said shared peripheral bus.

With respect to independent claim 15, applicant claims “a second shared peripheral bus interface connected to said video memory.” The specification does not disclose a second shared peripheral bus.

With respect to independent claim 18, applicant has amended the claim to disclose “... a remote shared peripheral bus...” The specification does not disclose a remote shared peripheral bus.

With respect to claim 18, applicant claims “wherein the second display screen is configured to display automatically certain notifications from received the Internet”. The specification does not disclose to display automatically certain notifications from received the Internet.

With respect to claim 19, applicant claims “a first bitmap configured to store image information transmitted to said second monitor” and “a second bitmap configured to store image information to be transmitted to said second monitor”. The limitations of “a first bitmap” and “a second bitmap” are not disclosed in the specification. Appropriate correction is requested.

The dependent claims 16, 17, and 20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as they depend upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,191,758) in view of Shimotono (US 6,509,911) and further in view of Alloul et al (US 6,144,363).

As to independent claim 18, limitations of claims 15, above and further comprising, Lee discloses wherein said second monitor includes, a display screen (Fig. 6, item 54), a display controller (Fig. 6, item 612) coupled to said display screen, a video memory (Fig. 6, item 622) coupled to said display controller, a bus interfaced coupled to said video memory (Fig. 6, bus).

Art Unit: 2675

Lee does not disclose a separate shared peripheral bus interface. Shimotono discloses in col. 5, lines 26-37, where a bridge-circuit 240 in this embodiment has a USB (Universal Serial Bus) host controller and a routing hub for connecting a USB and a USB port 238, which is formed in the wall of the computer 100. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the monitor system of Lee to incorporate the separate peripheral bus interface in order to connect secondary monitors as well as other peripheral devices. The USB supports a hot plugging function for the insertion and removal of additional peripheral devices (USB devices) while the computer 100 is powered on, and a plug-and-play function for automatically identifying newly connected peripheral devices and for re-setting the system configuration. A maximum of 63 USB devices can be daisy-chained and connected to a single USB port. Example USB devices are keyboards, mouse, joysticks, scanners, printers, modems, display motors, and tablets.

Lee and Shimotono do not disclose wherein the second display screen is configured to display automatically certain notifications received from the Internet. Alloul et al disclose in col. 3, lines 44-52 and in col. 4, lines 8-26, where in the computer system, automatic updates are received from the Internet email. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of automatic updates as shown by Alloul et al in col. 3, lines 44-52, col. 4, lines 8-26 as having such updates are advantageous at they provide updated applications without user intervention.

5. Claims 15-17, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,191,758) in view of Shimotono (US 6,509,911) in view of Alloul et al (6,144,363) and in view of Craig (US 5,790,176) and further in view of Friedman (US 5,032,083).

Art Unit: 2675

As to independent claim 15, Lee discloses a host computer (fig. 1, item 14), a first monitor connected to said host computer (10), a second monitor (12) separate and unattached to said first monitor and smaller than said first monitor (12);

Lee does not disclose a separate shared peripheral bus interface. Shimotono discloses in col. 5, lines 26-37, where a bridge-circuit 240 in this embodiment has a USB (Universal Serial Bus) host controller and a routing hub for connecting a USB and a USB port 238, which is formed in the wall of the computer 100. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the monitor system of Lee to incorporate the separate peripheral bus interface in order to connect secondary monitors as well as other peripheral devices. The USB supports a hot plugging function for the insertion and removal of additional peripheral devices (USB devices) while the computer 100 is powered on, and a plug-and-play function for automatically identifying newly connected peripheral devices and for re-setting the system configuration. A maximum of 63 USB devices can be daisy-chained and connected to a single USB port. Example USB devices are keyboards, mouse, joysticks, scanners, printers, modems, display motors, and tablets.

Lee discloses a video driver (Fig. 5, item 516) in said host computer for providing a portion of a display on said first monitor to said second monitor (col. 1, line 64-col 2, line 13);

Lee discloses in Fig 1, where the second monitor display is considerably smaller than the first. Lee does not disclose where the second display screen is smaller than 8.5 inches diagonally. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the second display screen could have easily been smaller than 8.5 inches diagonally.

Lee discloses a display controller coupled to said display screen (16), a video memory (36) coupled to said display controller, a bus interfaced coupled to said video memory (14), second monitor is powered by said shared peripheral bus (fig. 1, item 14, col. 6, lines 19-30)

Lee and Shimotono do not disclose a compression unit in said host computer for compressing said portion of said display for transmission to said second monitor. Craig discloses an MPEG encoder as shown in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an MPEG encoder into that of Lee and Shimotono as Craig is transmitting video over a network, similar to that of Shimotono. The MPEG encoder for video is advantageous as it provides compressed video, which can in turn be transmitted at higher speeds.

Lee and Shimotono do not disclose wherein the second display screen is configured to display automatically a specific type of application. Alloul et al disclose in col. 3, lines 44-52 and in col. 4, lines 8-26, where in the computer system, automatic updates are received from the internet email. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature of automatic updates as in conventional computer systems, applications are loaded on to the hard drive and where such updates to internet email are provided by internet providers as is disclosed by Alloul et al in col. 3, lines 44-52 and col. 4, lines 8-26.

Lee, Shimotono, Craig and Alloul et al do not disclose wherein the second monitor is configured to function as a control pad for the first monitor. Friedman discloses in Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 26-29 a display (item 48) which is shown to be a display control pad in addition to a main display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the control pad feature of Friedman into the system of Lee as Friedman discloses in col. 3, lines 54-58, the

Art Unit: 2675

control pad feature enables the user to select and input data into the microprocessor as well as provide display features.

As to dependent claim 16, limitations of claim 15, and further comprising, Lee does not disclose wherein said shared peripheral bus is a universal serial bus (USB). Shimotono disclose in col. 5, lines 26-37, where a bridge-circuit 240 in this embodiment has a USB (Universal Serial Bus) host controller and a routing hub for connecting a USB and a USB port 238, which is formed in the wall of the computer 100. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the USB of Shimotono into the monitor system of Lee in order to connect secondary monitors as well as other peripheral devices. The USB supports a hot plugging function for the insertion and removal of additional peripheral devices (USB devices) while the computer 100 is powered on, and a plug-and-play function for automatically identifying newly connected peripheral devices and for re-setting the system configuration. A maximum of 63 USB devices can be daisy-chained and connected to a single USB port. Example USB devices are keyboards, mouse, joysticks, scanners, printers, modems, display motors, and tablets.

As to dependent claim 17, limitations claim 15, and further comprising, Lee discloses a software operating system controlling said first computer, said operating system controlling the transmission of video data to said second monitor (col. 5, lines 30-56).

As to dependent claim 20, limitations of claim 15, and further comprising, Lee and Shimotono do not disclose wherein the monitor system is configured to learn an appropriate application to display automatically on the second monitor based on a previous action by a user.

Alloul et al disclose in col. 3, lines 44-52 and in col. 4, lines 8-26, where in the computer system, automatic updates are received from the Internet email. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2675

one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of automatic updates as shown by Alloul et al in col. 3, lines 44-52, col. 4, lines 8-26 as having such updates are advantageous at they provide updated applications without user intervention.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 21 are allowed.

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to independent claim 1, the prior art of record do not disclose the feature of a video driver in said host computer for providing a portion of a display on said first monitor to said second monitor, said video driver being operable to compare said first and second memories to determine whether or not a first portion of an image displayed on said second monitor is to be modified and a second portion of said image displayed on said second monitor is to be left unmodified.

Dependent claims 1-3, 5-14 and 21 are allowed as they depend upon an allowed base claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2675

With respect to Claims 15 and 18, the limitations are rejected as shown above by 35 USC 112, 1st Paragraph on the grounds of enablement. As disclosed above, the limitations are not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not disclose an internal bus. Further, the specification does not disclose where a first shared peripheral bus interface couples an internal bus to said shared peripheral bus. The specification also, does not disclose a remote peripheral bus. With respect to claims 15 and 18, the limitation of where a power input is connected to said shared peripheral bus is not disclosed by the specification.

Applicant argues on page 7, lines 4-10 of the amendment where the internal bus is shown by Fig 2 “connecting the microprocessor 24, graphic processor 25, etc” and where “if the Examiner wishes, the description section can be amended to specifically recite the internal bus”. Examiner disagrees with this argument. Nothing in the specification or in Fig. 2 indicates this connecting line to be the internal bus. If Applicant amends the description section of the specification to specifically recite this line to be the internal bus as this would be considered new matter as it was not originally described to be the internal bus.

Applicant also claims a first and second shared peripheral bus, which are not disclosed by the specification.

With respect to claim 1, as shown above, has been allowed.

Art Unit: 2675

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 571 272 7769.

The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar
Examiner
Art Unit 2675

SKK
June 13, 2005


SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER